

It is hereby ORDERED that the briefing schedule for Defendants Hanke and IOLO Global LLC's Motion to Stay Discovery (Dkt. 39) is ADJOURNED *sine die*. It is further ORDERED that Defendants Hanke and IOLO Global LLC's request for the Court to set a time to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint, which would require vacating the Court's previous Order granting a request from those very Defendants to stay their time to answer the Complaint (*see* Dkts.

33, 34), is DENIED.

In addition, in order to avoid unnecessary expenditure of the Court's and the parties' resources, the Court finds good cause to stay the date by which all Defendants must respond to the Complaint until fourteen days after entry of the Court's decision(s) on the parallel Motions to Dismiss filed in the Related Case. (Dkt. 34.) The Court emphasizes that, regardless of whether a Defendant prevails on its Motion to Dismiss in the Related case, each Defendant must answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint in this case. The Court further emphasizes that it will not allow parties to relitigate identical arguments raised in a Motion to Dismiss filed in this case if those arguments have been made by a Defendant and rejected in the Related Case.

In light of this Order, Defendant Roy-Haeger need not submit a letter response to the Court's December 4, 2020 Order (Dkt. 44), requiring that she specify whether she consents to a stay of the briefing schedule on her Motion to Dismiss pending the resolution of her motion in the Related Case.

The Clerk of the Court is respectfully directed to terminate the motions pending at document numbers 47 and 49.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 11, 2020
New York, New York

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John P. Cronan", is written over a horizontal line.

JOHN P. CRONAN
United States District Judge